REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 29, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-21 were pending and rejected claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-21. Claims 1, 8, 12, 13 and 21 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, no new claims have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-21 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Gomes, U.S. Patent No. 6,615,209. Gomes is directed to a method of reducing the amount of data viewed (indexed) in a internet search engine query by detecting duplicate content. This in contrast to the present claims that are directed to a method of providing a list of "bookmarks" or favorites stored in a web server. Bookmarks or favorites are returned to the client in an HTML page, the content of the page based on the access site information of the client of where the user is located.

An Interview was conducted with the Examiner and the substance of the Interview is discussed below.

On page 3 of the Office Action it is stated that "[t]he reference teaches receiving from a client a query for the 'muppet faq' (receiving from a client a request for information), the request containing 'muppet faq' (piece of access site information)." The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the rejection with an argument. The Office is being overly broad in interpreting the search string "muppet faq" as "containing a piece of access site information containing information on the location of an access site through which said client accesses said network." Claim 1 in part recites:

> a receiving module receiving, from said client, a providing request for the information, the providing request containing a piece of access site information **containing information on the location of an access site address where the user is located and from which said client accesses said network**, wherein said client has a plurality of access sites and accesses said network through a selected access site among said plurality of access sites. [Emphasis added]

The Office contends that "a piece of access site information" is the search string "muppet faq." But, the claim also defines that the "piece of access site information" contains a **location of an access site from** which the client accesses the network. As discussed with the Examiner, it is

6

respectfully submitted that the search string cannot be the location through which the client access the network. As the search string does not contain the location through which the client accesses the network. It is respectfully submitted that the Office's interpretation requires "muppet faq" to be a location, which it clearly is not.

As also discussed with the Examiner, the present invention is trying to solve what could be called a bookmark or favorites listing problem. A favorites list typically includes an information title and an associated URL for each favorite. When a user is at work and the user is located at a network address for his work client the user has one list of favorites, such as favorites that are used on the job. When the same user is at home and located at a network address for his home client the user may have another list of favorites, such as favorites that are for the user's hobbies. The user may not want to use the same favorites list for home and the job. The present invention solves this problem by providing a different list at each user location. That is, the request for the URLs/titles list contains "a piece of access site information containing information on the location of an access site address **where the user is located and from which said client accesses said network**" (emphasis added). With this access site information the system retrieves ("retrieving") "URLs corresponding to the piece of access site information" and generates ("generating") "a document containing the retrieved URLs and the retrieved titles" and then transmits ("transmitting") "the generated document to said client" so that the user at the client "obtains a different document according to said selected access site" (see claim 1).

Claims 8, 12 and 13 emphasize a similar feature.

As recognized by the Examiner in the Interview, the prior art does not teach or suggest such.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 and claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable from Gomes.

As per claim 6, nothing in Gomes as cited discusses the "access site information" is the location of the client. Therefore, Gomes does not disclose "wherein the access site information is a source address of the providing request," as in claim 6.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Gifford, U.S. Patent No. 5,812,776. Gifford discusses a system for redirecting a user to an authentication page when a session identifier (SID) is unavailable.

The Office Action at page 8 states Gifford col. 4 lines 9-19 and 50-57 discloses

"producing a document comprising information title and uniform resource locator for the requested information, the information produced by relating the network address of the client to the uniform resource locator," as recited in claim 21. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the rejection with an argument. The cited reference does not produce a document where the URL within the document is modified based on the location from which the client accesses the server. Gifford as stated above, discusses redirecting a browser to a different URL when a session identifier is not available from the client.

With respect to claim 21, the above discussed favorites list problem is solved by "correlating" the URLs/titles of the favorites to the client address. That way if the user logs on from home those URLs/titles that are correlated to the home network address are provided to the user and when the user logs on from the office or work those URLs/titles that are correlated to the work network address are provided to the user. Gifford does not recognize much less solve this problem.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 21 is patentably distinguishable from Gifford.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: ___October 1, 2007___   By: _____/J. Randall Beckers/___
                                          J. Randall Beckers
                                          Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501